

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 12, 16, 26, 28, 31, 32, 37, 39, 42, 46-56, and 58 have been amended.

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-20, 23, 26-34, 37, 39-50, 53, and 56-60 are in the application. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

Claims 1-7, 13-20, 23, 29-37, 43-50, 53 and 60 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Walker et al (“Walker”) in view of Boushy, both of record.

Walker discloses an electronic amusement device and a method for operating the device are disclosed. A slot machine server controls a secondary game of chance played at a client slot machine. The server receives a player identifier corresponding to a player and a client identifier corresponding to a client slot machine. The server retrieves registration data relating to a secondary game of chance corresponding to the player identifier and the client identifier. The server further receives an outcome from the client slot machine and analyzes the outcome based on game requirements associated with the secondary game of chance, thereby determining whether the outcome satisfies at least one of the game requirements. Once all of the game requirements have been satisfied, the server updates a session status indicating the completion of the game requirements.

Walker does not disclose a progressive bonus game that is incremented by storing a first and second set of game outcomes associated with a set of participating progressive players and an progressive bonus parameter set, wherein the set includes a time period in which the outcomes of the respective sets occurred. In Walker’s FIG 5a, the non-solo games have no game play time limit. Boushy discloses a system and method for implementing a customer tracking and recognition program that encompasses customers’ gaming and non-gaming activity alike at a plurality of affiliated casino properties. Customer information is accumulated at each affiliated casino through one or more LAN-based management systems, updated to a central patron database (CPDB) that is coupled to each casino LAN through a WAN, and made available to each affiliated casino property as needed. However, there are no specific progressive bonus awards that are tracked and stored since all points are cumulative. Boushy, col. 8, lines 55-64. The point awards have a monetary value

and are redeemable for gifts, meals, cash and the like, at any of the casino properties, but they are not associated with specific bonus parameter sets, nor are the sets tied to a specific time period. It would not be obvious to make modifications to Walker and Boushy to arrive at the presently claimed features.

It is therefore submitted that the combination of Walker and Boushy does not form a *prima facie* case of obviousness. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 8-12 and 38-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker, Boushy, and further in view of Acres, U.S. Patent No. 6,319,125 (Acres). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Acres discloses a method and apparatus for controlling a bonusing promotion system using a bonus server interconnected to a plurality of gaming devices is described. A percentage of a wager played on each gaming device is accumulated into a bonus pool stored on the bonus server. The bonus pool is compared to a threshold value stored on the bonus server each time the bonus pool changes. One of the gaming devices is selected when the threshold value is substantially met. A bonus prize funded by the bonus pool is awarded to the selected gaming device. Acres does not remedy the deficiencies of the primary references discussed above. Moreover, Acres' progressive jackpot is not related to a set of progressive bonus parameters. The bonus is awarded merely after there has been a designated coin-in collection by the players. Col. 8, lines 1-5. There is also no time limit for attaining this. There are not different set of bonus players for the pot, so there can be no first and second sets of game outcomes. The secondary prizes awarded stem from the same set of outcomes as the primary prize. Col. 8, lines 38-67.

Accordingly, Acres does not remedy the deficiencies of the primary references. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 24-28 and 54-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker, Boushy, Acres, and further in view of McCrea, Jr., U.S. Patent No. 6,346,044 (McCrea). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The independent claims from which the rejected claims depend are claims 16 and 46, which have been discussed above in connection with the other rejections. McCrea does not remedy the deficiencies of Walker, Boushy and Acres. McCrea

discloses a game table system, adapted for multiple sites under a central control, for providing a progressive jackpot in a live card game played at each gaming table between a dealer and a player. Each gaming table has an ante bet region, a dealer card region, and a player card region. The game table system of the present invention includes a sensor located at each bet region for detecting the value of the ante placed by the player at that location, a reader identifying each card dealt during the play of the game to the player and to the dealer, a computer connected to the sensor and the reader and the progressive jackpot for adding a predetermined percentage of the value of the ante to the progressive jackpot when a predetermined game event (such as the dealer going bust during the game of blackjack) occurs while preserving the value of the ante during the conventional play of the game.

McCrea does not remedy the deficiencies of the primary references discussed above.

These dependent claims incorporate the limitations of their related independent claims, and are therefore patentable at least on this basis.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the examiner believe that minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the examiner is urged to call applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

____/Reginald J. Suyat/_____
Reginald J. Suyat
Reg. No. 28,172

Beyer Weaver LLP
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100